FILE COPY

FILED
FEB 17 1936
CHARLES ELMORE CROPLEY
CLERK

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

OCTOBER TERM, 1935

No. 610

NORFOLK AND WESTERN RAILROAD COMPANY, Appellant

vs.

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA on Relation of A. J. MAXWELL, Commissioner of Revenue

---

Brief of Appellee

ON APPEAL FROM THE SUPREME COURT OF NORTH CAROLINA

A. A. F. SEAWELL,
Attorney General of North Carolina,
HARRY MCMULLAN,
Assistant Attorney General of North Carolina,
I. M. BAILEY,
Counsel for Appellee:

INDEX

PAGE

OPINION OF COURT BELOW 1

JURISDICTION OF THE COURT 1

PRINCIPAL QUESTION INVOLVED 4

STATEMENT OF THE CASE 8

(a) No taxable income returned by appellant 8

(b) Income tax paid under protest 9

(c) Proceedings in state courts 9

FACTS INVOLVED 11

APPELLANT'S SPECIFICATIONS OF ERROR ANALYZED 12

(a) Appeal does not raise question of constitutionality of the statute per se, but only the unconstitutionality of the result of its application 12

(b) The North Carolina Supreme Court is a court of appeals on matters of law; it adopted no findings of the court below, but as to such findings passed only upon whether there was evidence 12

(c) Alleged admissions of the State, said in assignments of error to have been made, were not made 13

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT 16

ARGUMENT 18

I. Appellant's case in the court below rested entirely on the ascertainment of facts, and the burden was upon appellant. These facts were found on competent evidence as far as was necessary to find them, in accordance with the practice and procedure of the court, long established, entirely consistent with due process of law; and this Court, according to precedent, should not interfere with the result 18

The North Carolina law is constitutional upon its face 18

The issue raised and determined in the court below referred to net taxable income of appellant in the State of North Carolina 18

PAGE

The court below found necessary facts to determination of this issue 19

A general finding in a reference case is sufficient in law and approved in practice 20

This was a reference case, instigated by appellant 22

Objections to the procedure in the court below in detail ..... 22 et seq.

1. That the reviewing judge set aside findings of fact which were "admitted" by the State not true upon the second 22

2. The trial court, on review of the Referee's report, found all facts necessary to determine the issue 24

So-called admissions by the State not made .. 24
Impropriety of making findings demanded by the Railway 25

3. The Court had full power to set aside specific facts found by Referee 26

The Court not bound by the plan or scheme or category adopted by the Referee, in making its own findings 27

Appellant did not object to the report of Referee, thereby waiving exceptions to the evidence 27

General finding by the Court upon the issue is sufficient 27-28

4. That the trial court made findings of fact upon insufficient evidence is contradicted by the record 28

It was the duty of appellant to present evidence from which the Court might find facts regarding its gross operating ~~expenses~~ revenues ... 28-29

II. The appellant failed to carry the burden which rested upon it to show that it did not have the net income in North Carolina upon which the State imposed the tax; or that the application of the taxing formula produced an unconstitutional result. Evidence as to the Railway's

PAGE

gross operating revenues was not only relevant, it was required of the Railway to sustain its contention in this case 30

A. Burden was upon this appellant to show that it did not have net income in North Carolina 30

Appellant could not rely on mileage prorate averaged revenue determined by the statute 30

North Carolina income statute quoted and analyzed ..... 31 et seq.

B. Fallacy of substituting averaged mileage prorate result for actual revenue 35

Fact situation analyzed 37

Finding of Referee which appellant contends should have been retained 38-39

(a) Appellant's view of mileage prorate erroneous 39

(b) Administration rules and proceedings not binding on the Court 40

(c) Necessity for producing proof does not justify use of the formula attacked 41

(d) It was not the function of the trial court to find any amount of net income for purpose of alternate assessment 42-43

(e) Factual situations upon which Court must find facts 43

III. There was no merit in the contention of the appellant on the hearing in the court below upon the facts ascertained upon the trial, and its constitutional rights have not been invaded 45

A. (a) Appellant's citations of authority are not relevant to this case 45

(b) This case is controlled by the principle announced in Underwood Typewriter Co. *v.* Chamberlain and Maxwell *v.* Kent-Coffey Co. 46

PAGE

B. (a) The method of setting up expenses criticised 46

(b) Evidence bearing on Railway's actual gross operating expenses in North Carolina, 49 et seq.

CONCLUSION 56

CITED CASES

Aetna Life Insurance Co. v. Dunken, 266 U. S. 389, 69 L. Ed. 342 (4).

American Express R. R. Co. v. F. S. Royster Guano Co., 273 U. S. 274, 71 L. Ed. 642 (8).

Appleby v. City of New York, 271 U. S. 364, 70 L. Ed. 992 (8).

Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Co. v. Doughton, 262 U. S. 413, 67 L. Ed. 1051 (6), (12), (18), (25), (32), (44).

Baker v. Edwards, 176 N. C. 229, 97 S. E. 610 (10).

Bancroft v. Roberts, 46 N. C. 363 (28).

Board of Trade of Winston-Salem v. Norfolk & Western Railroad Co., 16 I. C. C. 12 (54), (55).

Campau v. Lewis, 3 Wall. 106, 18 L. Ed. 211 (2).

Caruth Byrnes Hdw. Co. v. Walter, 91 Mo. 844 (28).

Central Vermont R. R. Co. v. White, 238 U. S. 507, 59 L. Ed. 1433 (3), (29).

Charlotte Shippers Ass'n. v. Southern R. R. Co., 11 I. C. C. 109 (56).

Cincinnati Street R. R. Co. v. Snell, 193 U. S. 30, 48 L. Ed. 604, (3), (29).

Clipper Mining Co. v. Land Co., 194 U. S. 220, 48 L. Ed. 944 (2).

Consumer's Coal Co. v. A. & Y. R. R. Co., Dec. 11, 1935. (56).

Corporation Comm. of N. C. v. Aberdeen & Rockfish R. R. Co., 200 I. C. C. 71 (54).

Corporation Comm. of N. C. v. Norfolk & Western R. R. Co., 19 I. C. C. 303 (54).

Crowell v. Benson, 285 U. S. 60 (3).

Cummings v. Swepson, 124 N. C. 579, 32 S. E. 966 (10), (27).

Danville v. Southern Railroad Co., 18 I. C. C. 409 (56).

Great Northern R. R. Co. v. Donaldson, 246 U. S. 121, 62 L. Ed. 616 (2).

Hall v. Jordan, 15 Wall. 393, 21 L. Ed. 72 (2).
Hans-Rees Sons v. Maxwell, 283 U. S. 173, 75 L. Ed. 879 (18), (46).
Hedrick v. Atchinson R. R. Co., 67 U. S. 673, 42 L. Ed. 230 (4).
Henderson Bridge Co. v. Henderson, 173 U. S. 592, 43 L. Ed. 823 (20), (57).
Hihn v. Peck, 30 Cal. 280 (28).
Kentucky Finance Corp. v. Paramount Auto Exch. Corp., 262 U. S. 554, 71 L. Ed. 1165 (2), (29).
Lee v. Central of Georgia R. R. Co., 252 U. S. 109, 64 L. Ed. 482 (3), (29).
Maxwell v. Kent-Coffey Mfg. Co., 204 N. C. 365, 291 U. S. 642 (46), (57).
Miedreich v. Lauenstien, 132 U. S. 236, 58 L. Ed. 584 (2).
McNeil v. Hodges, 105 N. C. 52, 11 S. E. 265 (10), (27).
New York v. Roberts, 171 U. S. 658, 19 S. Ct. 658 (2).
Pitt v. Lansdale, 32 Ind. 218 (28).
Portland R. Light & Power Co. v. R. R. Commission, 229 U. S. 397, 57 L. Ed. 1248 (2).
Power Mfg. Co. v. Saunders, 274 U. S. 491, 71 L. Ed. 1165 (3), (29).
Preston v. Sturges, 133 Fed. 1 (41).
Quong Ham Wah Co. v. Ind. Acc. Com. of Cal., 255 U. S. 445, 65 L. Ed. 723 (8).
Saltonstall v. Saltonstall, 276 U. S. 260, 72 L. Ed. 565 (6).
Smiley v. Kansas, 196 U. S. 447, 49 L. Ed. 546 (2), (4).
Southern P. Co. v. Schuler, 227 U. S. 601, 57 L. Ed. 662 (2).
Southern Railroad v. Kentucky, 274 U. S. 76, 71 L. Ed. 934 (45).
Southern Rate Investigation, 100 I. C. C. 513 (54), (55).
Supreme Lodge v. Mayer, 265 U. S. 30, 68 L. Ed. 885 (8).
Thigpen v. Farmers Banking Etc., Co., 203 N. C. 291, 165 S. E. 720 (10), (27).
Underwood Typewriter Co. v. Chamberlain, 254 U. S. 113, 65 L. Ed. 165 (7), (8), (30), (46), (57).
Union Tank Co. v. Wright, 249 U. S. 275, 63 L. Ed. 602 (45).
United States v. Ramsay, 158 Fed. 488 (28).
Vest v. Cooper, 75 N. C. 519 (28).
Wallace v. Benner, 200 N. C. 124, 156 S. E. 795 (10), (27).
Wallace v. Douglas, 103 N. C. 191, 9 S. E. 453 (10), (27).

Wallace v. Hines, Director Gen., 253 U. S. 66, 64 L. Ed. 782 (45).

Waters Pierce Oil Co. v. Texas, 212 U. S. 86, 53 L. Ed. 417 (2), (4).

TEXT BOOKS

Hughes, Federal Practice, V. 5, p. 331 (8).

STATUTES

Public Laws, N. C. 1927, Section 312 (5), (31).

Public Laws, N. C. 1929, Section 312 (5) (31).

C. S. 578 (Michie's N. C. Code, 1935), (10), (27).